

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 94 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #335
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 29 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 335

Today's Topics:

 Digital Spectrum Offer
 short cuts
 What is wrong with h
 What is wrong with ham radio (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 28 Jul 94 11:09:02 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Digital Spectrum Offer
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

After reading many posts regarding the unfairness of
the code requirement and the elitism of CW ops, and
superiority of one mode over another, I suggest an
alternative.

First:

A) It is a given that the ARRL will not support ths and
i honestly hope that i am wrong.

B) An influx of new hams is taking place and many of these
operators are interested in digital modes.

C) The future of amateur radio is getting licensed now.

with that said, here 'tis.

The usenet r.r.a.?? newsgroups constitute a watershed of hams with a de-facto interest in digital communications and radio-theory. The opinion of these participants vary widely (as evidenced by the constant bickering!). These factors combine to provide a forum for the development of a proposal for the modifications of the current state of HF spectrum management.

Proposed Alterations:

1) Novice Priv's to include digital-specific allocations, for example: 7075-7100; 14075-14100; similar allocations on one or more WARC bands.

2) Generation of an additional written exam, specific to the theory, implementation, and practice of digital modes. Coverage of data types, data rates, modulation techniques, bandwidth, hardware, on-air protocols, Propagation, RFI. and FCC regulations is expected.

I believe that the resulting impact would be to avail a large number of hams of spectrum prioritized for digital modes. This would be in keeping with the "technology infusion" theme of the no-code. No-code Techs are REAL hams with strengths that have nothing to do with triodes and air-variables.

WARNING! Flame Bait Ahead....

Q. How valid is a technology that is undergoing a spare-parts shortage?

ASIC's and microprocessors are cheap, reliable, versatile, and were developed to REPLACE tubes, crystals, hartley oscillators, and the like. Forcing 75 year old technology to be the yardstick for amateur radio places the future of the hobby in jeopardy.

Ahem....

If the energy of the Usenet participants was directed to change, the potential exists for a shift forward in the status of Ham Radio.

Any Takers???

pete brunelli, N1QDQ
brunelli_pc@delphi.com

Date: 27 Jul 1994 23:28:37 -0400
From: news.pipeline.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: short cuts
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com (Stan Olochwoszcz N2AYJ) wrote:

>
>:8{> - Poster has mustache, beard, and wears
>half-height reading glasses.

Damn, that looks like V.I. Lenin!

N2KS

Date: Thu, 28 Jul 94 17:34:00 -0400
From: news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

%f>CW is ham radio's golden calf and just about as useful as the
%f>original.
%f>73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Definitely not speaking for Intel)

Here, here....goodo!

If you could write a test for each major mode, what would they look
like, how would they test.

Maybe each mode that you want to operate on needs a test.....

I like that, yesy indeed.

Stay tuned.

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0
General Manager
Interactive Workplace Division
Vicom, LTD.
Phone: Edmonton Office
11603 165 St.
abm@world.std.com

, CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: 28 Jul 1994 11:30:37 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <RFM.94Jul27170658@urth.eng.sun.com>, Richard McAllister wrote:

>

> If the problem in learning code is motivation, which I'm not doubting,
> people who think widespread knowledge of code is a good thing need to think
> about the effectiveness of various motivating techniques. "You can't have
> your dessert until you finish your spinach" has never been one of the better
> ones. "Look at those people over there having a ball! Don't you wish you
> could do that?" is a pretty good one.

>

> Rich

>

>

>

>

> --

> Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

The only benefit learning a minimal amount of code is to prevent folks from using their computers from reading perfectly humanly copyable code and keep sending requests to resend everything. I 'really' like a computer CW op that gives me a 599 report and asks me to repeat half the transmission because his CW reader fouled up...

Andy

Date: 28 Jul 1994 11:30:52 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <199407271925.0AA17638@mixcom.mixcom.com>, kevin jessup wrote:
>.....

> I believe the above are fundamental questions that have NEVER been
> answered by the pro-CW crowd in r.r.a.p. Care to take a crack at
> them?

>

> --

> kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
> |
> | Call 1-800-682-1776
> | for more information.

>

I've always been an advocate of reduced CW and better theory tests. You're not the norm, though. Like you, I'm interested in utilizing higher bandwidths that are only achieved on the higher UHF frequencies (and microwaves, while we still have them). I was thrilled w/the nocode license idea. The problem is the personal attacks by the no-code group who make claims that can't even be substantiated by the FCC/ARRL. CW is a mode only. Learning a minimal speed is just an added incentive.

Andy

Date: 28 Jul 1994 11:30:22 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <RFM.94Jul27112856@urth.eng.sun.com>, Richard McAllister wrote:
> In article <MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net> domonkos@access.digex.net (Andy Domonkos) writes:

>

> >I went from 0 to 15 wpm in 30 days.

>

> Some people have the talent. It took me about 6 months of 30-60 minutes a
> day, which is a large portion of my free time. I think I'm more typical.
> Others have tried for years and never cracked the 10 WPM barrier. It's hard
> to tell ahead of time how long it will take a given person to learn.

>

> Please explain this "deal" to me. In particular, we're one USENET. Part
> of the "deal" here is if you say something dumb, you're likely to

> get toasted.
>
>
.....
>
> Rich
>
> --
> Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Rich and All,

I'm not attacking anyone here. I posted a response addressing the general theme carried on here the past several months. You have a valid point about the spare time issue. I favor a reduced CW (10WPM) test and a tougher theoretical test. No one ever said the process was easy, that's probably why on the whole the amateur bands work out pretty well. There are cases of misuse/abuse but the good outshines the bad. You'll never filter out bad personalities, you've got intelligent individuals in every personality category.

What it comes down to is how much effort a person is willing to use to achieve a privilege. I suspect that if it weren't for commercially available radio gear we wouldn't see a rush to the electronics stores to build kits to get on the air.

Andy

Date: 28 Jul 1994 11:30:00 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>, <3162ko\$002@chnews.intel.com>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <3162ko\$002@chnews.intel.com>, Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.h wrote:
> In article <MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>,
> Andy Domonkos <domonkos@access.digex.net> wrote:
> >
> >You knew what the deal was when you became a member of the community and
> >instead of making helpful suggestions you do nothing but attack your
> >fellow amateurs.
>
> You aren't attacking your fellow amateurs, are you?
>

> >How can anyone muster support in the ARRL when you do nothing but foster
> >opposition?
>
> You aren't fostering opposition, are you?
>
> >... I would vote to keep
> >things status quo until there was a serious attitude adjustment. Andy
>
> You want changes before allowing things to change?
> Gee, Andy, I wish you wouldn't complain so much. :-)
>
> 73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Not speaking for Intel)

Who's attacking who?

Andy

Date: 28 Jul 1994 16:29:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!isuvax.iastate.edu!TWP77@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>,
<CtLtzo.IpJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>,<zQyDkiubG2Z5066yn@access.digex.net>
Reply-To : twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <zQyDkiubG2Z5066yn@access.digex.net>, domonkos@access.digex.net (Andy Domonkos) writes:

>Funny how the attitude of most folks who upgrade take
>on a pro-code attitude later.

Funny how all folks who upgrade had to take a code test.
Funny how most "pro-code" attitudes seem to be more
"I had to do it, so you should, too" attitudes.

Date: 28 Jul 1994 14:05:04 -0600
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul27112856@urth.eng.sun.com>, <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com>,
<318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>,
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>,
<Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com> wrote:
>The filter is working to keep some of the brightest people out of ham radio.
>Why should a spread spectrum expert with a PHD degree in electronics
>have to learn Morse code? Nobody makes the CW people learn spread
>spectrum. Is CW more important than all other modes combined?

Because it's a requirement. We, as a society, have gotten away from meeting requirements in order to get privileges, and toward lowering requirements instead.

Yours is the same argument that was raised three years ago to cram the no-code Tech down our throats. Your PhD spread spectrum expert can now get a codeless Tech and make his contributions to the state of the amateur art. We were promised that we'd see lots of that kind of thing from all of the newly licensed technical experts just as soon as we did away with the nasty evil code requirement. Well, where is it?

Before I'll even consider any further relaxation of the entry standards into ham radio, I'm going to insist on seeing the promised technical innovations from the no-code Techs.

Used to be that if someone wanted something badly enough, he'd do what it took to get it. Now he just whines about "relevance" and tries to get standards lowered until he can get in with no work.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"From now on, when someone asks you where you're from, you tell 'em
'Houston, city of champions!'" -- Rudy Tomjanovich

Date: 28 Jul 1994 17:04:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!
scorpion.ch.intel.com!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.774906446@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<RFM.94Jul27112856@urth.eng.sun.com>, <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com>com
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com>,
Roger Buffington <rogjd@netcom.com> wrote:
>
>Something was wrong with your study approach.

Roger, please understand that not everyone's brain is capable of functioning as a modem. Some very bright people cannot learn Morse code. I'm beginning to believe it takes an idiot savant, based on some of these postings.

>In other words, the filter is working.

The filter is working to keep some of the brightest people out of ham radio. Why should a spread spectrum expert with a PHD degree in electronics have to learn Morse code? Nobody makes the CW people learn spread spectrum. Is CW more important than all other modes combined?

>We're getting all the new hams for all license classes that we need.

We are getting quantity at the expense of quality. The best Rf engineers I know are not hams because they can't be bothered with the triviality of Morse code. A lot of competent engineers think ham radio is a big joke because of the CW cub-scout mentality. (nothing against cub-scouts but in general, they are a little immature)

FYI, most of my HF contacts are CW. I like it but I don't worship it or try to cram it down anyone else's throat.

CW is ham radio's golden calf and just about as useful as the original.

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Definitely not speaking for Intel)

Date: Thu, 28 Jul 1994 08:28:35

From: ncar!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!s146.phxslip.indirect.com!lenwink@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3113tg\$o3m@crl4.crl.com>, <424@ted.win.net>,
<Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu>in
Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

In article <Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu>

Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>Path: indirect.com!news.sprintlink.net!hookup!news.umbc.edu!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!
adis-204.adis.brown.edu!user

>From: Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio)

>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>Subject: Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

>Followup-To: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>Date: 26 Jul 1994 15:33:46 GMT

>Organization: Brown University ADIR
>Lines: 18
>Message-ID: <Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu>
>References: <3113tg\$o3m@crl4.crl.com> <424@ted.win.net>
>NNTP-Posting-Host: adis-204.adis.brown.edu

>In article <424@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) wrote:

>> Has anyone here argued that all hams must be technical experts? (Well,
>> maybe one person...) There's a vast area between technical
>> illiterate and technical expert, and that's where most hams reside.
>> One of the purposes of incentive licensing is to move folks away from
>> the technical-illiterate starting line, but if a person is satisfied
>> with the privileges of one of the entry-level licenses then what?
>> Limited-duration entry-level licenses, anyone?

>I agree with having a limited duration for both the novice, tech+, and tech
>licensees. Say 2 years.

Does that mean we should penalize those who are no-code techs, get on
2m, have fun for about 3 months, then by elmering (remember elmering?),
learn about packet, get on packet, enjoy that for about 6 months, then find
out that ATV is fun and learn about it and get on ATV for a length of time,
then find out about AMSAT and become active in satellite work, then go
on to moonbounce, etc.; should they LOSE their license because they
don't take another test? Just wondering...

73, Len, KB7LPW

>

>--

>== Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR

>== Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu, Tel. (401) 863-1880 Fax. (401) 863-2269

>== The opinions above are my own and not those of my employer.

Date: 28 Jul 1994 11:29:48 -0400

From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>,

<MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>, <CtLtzo.IpJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <CtLtzo.IpJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>, Jeffrey Herman wrote:

>

> What a wonderfully written article! I think I'll save it and repost

> it once per month during this monthly code debate; hope you don't
> mind, Andy.
>
> 73,
> Jeff NH6IL
> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu
>

Be my guest Jeff. Funny how the attitude of most folks who upgrade take on a pro-code attitude later. Guess we have to give folks the time to learn. I think a lot of people out there should investigate the GMRS Radio system since it gives them repeater access to talk to their families, since that what many new hams are doing. No technical test and they buy a license. Radio Shack should stress that more than the ham gear their selling.

Andy

Date: 28 Jul 94 22:25:50 GMT
From: biosci!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<paulf.775348434@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <RFM.94Jul27170658@urth.eng.sun.com>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>If the problem in learning code is motivation, which I'm not doubting,
>people who think widespread knowledge of code is a good thing need to think
>about the effectiveness of various motivating techniques. "You can't have
>your dessert until you finish your spinach" has never been one of the better
>ones. "Look at those people over there having a ball! Don't you wish you
>could do that?" is a pretty good one.

I couldn't agree more. I cringe whenever I see the Aged Flatuletia spout off about tradition and whining and CB and whatever-ad-hominem. The utility of a skill should be in line with the effort required to acquire it, as a general principle. That means that not only do you need to demonstrate utility (hey, skill "N" is used by "X" amateurs) but you also need to show that it's not going to take forever to acquire (and that you don't lose it overnight having acquired it).

As an aside, my current feeling of the consensus of .policy is that just about everyone would like to the current license structure changed, to one which has only two or three licenses, with the HF classes requiring 5 wpm or 5 and

10-13 wpm. Folks who want to maintain the current structure or nuke CW entirely are generally a tiny minority. It's important to keep in mind that this is therefore **not** an all-or-nothing issue.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX	"The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU	-- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #335
